UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,205	12/31/2003	Alexander Berger	MSFT-2863/306352.1	9206

41505   7590   05/28/2008
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
LIE, ANGELA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 March 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4,7-18 and 20-22_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4,7-18 and 20-22_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _31 December 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1, 13, and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

2.   It is understood that the target datastore holds data associated with the

datasource, therefore it also seems obvious that data in the target datastore would not

be modified unless source datasource was altered. Consequently, first and second

persistence models seem interchangeable at least until data is modified. The applicant

is suggested to amend the claim language to clearly differentiate between those two

rules. For instance adding clarification such as: pertaining both metadata and previous

data changes made to the datastore despite of the new changes made to the linked

source object, would clearly identify the difference between first two rules.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
> United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
> by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
> title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4.   The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5.   **Claims 1, 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated**

by Hurmiz et al (US Publication No. 2005/0108271).

        As to claims 1, 13 and 22, Hurmiz discloses a method of sharing database

objects between a source datastore (Figure 1, element 107) and a target datastore

(Figure 1, element 109), comprising the following steps: linking at least one object in the

source datastore to an object in the target datastore (paragraph 45, lines 7-11, wherein

database 107 can not update or modify specific objects in the data records (109) unless

the specific objects in those two datastores are linked and paragraph 84); specifying a

persistence model for controlling how changes to the linked source object are handled

by the target datastore, the persistence mode further comprising <u>one of</u> persisting

metadata in the target datastore such that changes to metadata of the linked source

object are not updated in the target datastore until object data of the linked source

object is altered (paragraph 26), persisting both metadata and object data changes of

the linked source object in the target datastore, and persisting neither metadata nor

data in the target datastore such that any change made to the linked source object is

propagated to the target datastore; specifying a refresh policy for refreshing information

in the target datastore (paragraph 26, wherein database management system (107)

controls the storing, retrieving and updating of data and metadata in database records,

and all those functions are associated with a policy (i.e. how often data should be

updated etc)); and integrating data from the object in the source datastore to the target

datastore (paragraph 26, lines 5-6).

As to claim 2, Hurmiz discloses the method further comprising the step of

selecting at least one group of measures in the source datastore as the linked source

object (Figure 5, element 503, 505 etc).

As to claim 9, Hurmiz discloses the method further comprising the step of

specifying a filter for the target datastore (paragraph 9, wherein specifying who can

access the datastore is considered a filter).

As to claim 10, Hurmiz discloses the method wherein the filter limits data

accessible by the target datastore to data of a specified type (paragraph 9, wherein it

can be specified what type of data each user has a permission to access).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hurmiz et al (US Publication No. 2005/0108271) in view of Le (US Publication No.

2005/0076036).

As to claims 3, 4 and 21, Hurmiz teaches all the limitations disclosed in claim 1, however he does not explicitly teach the source datastore and target datastore being OLAP databases. Le teaches system for updating multidimensional databases, comprising source and target datastores, wherein those datastores are OLAP databases (paragraph 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art during time the invention was made to use OLAP databases as taught by Le, as Hurmiz's source and target datastores, in order to increase the functionality of the system, for instance generating summary of data in the database.

As to claims 7,8 and 18, Hurmiz does not explicitly teach refreshing data each time data in the target datastore is queried or refreshing data whenever the specified time interval has passed. Le teaches the system comprising two databases wherein data is refreshed whenever a user access it and further the user naturally has control over frequency of access (paragraph 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art during time the invention was made to refresh data every time a user access data or refresh according to specified time intervals because setting refresh time policy is very well known in the art, furthermore in order to update data certain policy has to be specified so that the content of the database comprises the most recent information.

As to claims 11,12 and 14-17, Hurmiz teaches all the limitations in claims 1 and 13 respectively, however he does not explicitly teach linked source object being a dimension or a measure group. Le teaches multidimensional databases comprising dimensions and measure group. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the during time the invention was made to use dimensions and group measures as taught by Le, in Hurmiz's source and target datastores in order to improve the information execution time.

8.   With respect to claims 16 and 17, Hurmiz teaches linking specific objects (paragraphs 45 and 84).

9.   **Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al (US Publication No. 2005/0108271) in view of Pasumansky (US Publication No. 6477536).** Hurmiz teaches all the limitations disclosed in claim 13, however he does not explicitly teach source and target datstores residing on two computers. Pasumansky teaches the network comprising the server and client computers wherein systems share common dimensions (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art during time the invention was made to place source and target datastores on separate computers to reduce the traffic to the target datastore. In other words since target and source would share some information (dimensions), all of the client computers would not have to connect only to the target datastore at all time, instead some of them could connect to source database.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filed March 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11.   With respect to the applicant's assertion on page 7, fourth paragraph, wherein it
is submitted that "While data management system 107 controls the storing, retrieving,
and updating of data and metadata in database records 109(a) - 109(n), there is nothing
to teach or suggest linking at least one dimension between a source datastore and a
target datastore", the examiner disagrees. One of ordinary skill in the art would quickly
recognize that source datastore (database (107) is a relational database (paragraph
[0026]), connected to the database records (109) as indicated in figure 2 (i.e. elements
107 and 109(a)-109(n)), thus there must be at least one object (entry) referenced
(related/linked) between those two storages. Moreover, in paragraph [0047] it is clearly
indicated that databases 107 and 109 both store data related and needed to organize a
presentation (i.e. contain objects related/linked to each other). Furthermore, it is
important to note that database 107 is responsible for updating, storing and retrieving
data from database records (target), therefore at the very least the temporary link has to
be created between an object in the database 107 and an object in databases 109, till
that task is accomplished. Consequently, the examiner maintains that Hurmiz teaches
"linking at least one object in the source datastore to an object in the target datastore".

12.   Furthermore, the applicant alleges also on page 7, last paragraph, that "Hurmiz
et al. does not specify a persistence model for the "target datastore", let alone any
options as to how data and metadata would be persisted in linked objects", again the
examiner strongly disagrees. The term "model" is extremely broad. It could be equated
to a representation of an action. So for instance a save or a cancel buttons could be
considered models with respect to what a user desires to do with the data. For instance,

if a user modifies data and does not click save, the data will not be committed,

otherwise it will. In the context of the prior art, Hurmiz teaches that database 107 stores,

retrieves and updates data and metadata, so at the very least it represents a model for

updating (i.e. not persisting) data in the target datastore (i.e. 109). Consequently, the

examiner maintains that Hurmiz indeed teaches a persistence model.

The Prior Art

13.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Wu et al (US Patent No 6981114) disclose method of mirroring data
  between multiple datastores.

Conclusion

14.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Angela M. Lie whose telephone number is 571-272-

8445. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

16.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

17.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Angela M Lie/
Examiner, Art Unit 2163

/don wong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art

Unit 2163